

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Wisconsin

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Wisconsin. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Wisconsin, 1413 of a possible 1695 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .834, for a rating of 83.4%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality/resolution, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q2, “Were the dates the imagery was flown useful for crop compliance work?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.903225806	Mean	2.967741935	Mean	4.730769231	Mean	4.838709677	Mean	4.421052632
Standard Error	0.209222003	Standard Error	0.234102592	Standard Error	0.08871202	Standard Error	0.067150516	Standard Error	0.158866406
Median	4	Median	3	Median	5	Median	5	Median	5
Mode	5	Mode	2	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5
Standard Deviation	1.164898814	Standard Deviation	1.303428069	Standard Deviation	0.452344321	Standard Deviation	0.373878251	Standard Deviation	0.692482609
Sample Variance	1.356989247	Sample Variance	1.698924731	Sample Variance	0.204615385	Sample Variance	0.139784946	Sample Variance	0.479532164
Kurtosis	-1.109251446	Kurtosis	-1.046405346	Kurtosis	-0.849950964	Kurtosis	1.867752937	Kurtosis	-0.36725776
Skewness	-0.612061556	Skewness	0.352928919	Skewness	-1.105352664	Skewness	-1.936828179	Skewness	-0.808021577
Range	3	Range	4	Range	1	Range	1	Range	2
Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	4	Minimum	4	Minimum	3
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	121	Sum	92	Sum	123	Sum	150	Sum	84
Count	31	Count	31	Count	26	Count	31	Count	19
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	4.592592593	Mean	4.28	Mean	4.518518519	Mean	8.129032258	Mean	7.933333333
Standard Error	0.133538936	Standard Error	0.168522995	Standard Error	0.111584935	Standard Error	0.261270409	Standard Error	0.324952104
Median	5	Median	5	Median	5	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	10
Standard Deviation	0.693888666	Standard Deviation	0.842614977	Standard Deviation	0.579812328	Standard Deviation	1.454692075	Standard Deviation	1.779835973
Sample Variance	0.481481481	Sample Variance	0.71	Sample Variance	0.336182336	Sample Variance	2.116129032	Sample Variance	3.167816092
Kurtosis	6.374310423	Kurtosis	-1.33004227	Kurtosis	-0.413415685	Kurtosis	-1.014277216	Kurtosis	-1.022883516
Skewness	-2.222275574	Skewness	-0.595207702	Skewness	-0.716187319	Skewness	-0.100021457	Skewness	-0.24650085
Range	3	Range	2	Range	2	Range	4	Range	6
Minimum	2	Minimum	3	Minimum	3	Minimum	6	Minimum	4
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	124	Sum	107	Sum	122	Sum	252	Sum	238
Count	27	Count	25	Count	27	Count	31	Count	30

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

